DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 938 UD 008 153

By-Williams, E. Belvin; Tannenbaum, Robert S.

Educational Enrichment for Disadvantaged Inschool Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees During the Summer 1967. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects 1966-67.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.
Spons Agency-New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Pub Date Nov 67
Note-63p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.25
Descriptors-Agency Role, Board of Education Role, Boards of Education, Community Agencies (Public), *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Programs, *Enrichment Programs, Federal Programs, Program Descriptions, Program Effectiveness, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, Summer Programs, Teacher Attitudes, *Youth Programs
Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Neighborhood Youth Corps, New York City, NYC

A 1967 evaluation of New York City's Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) educational enrichment program presents the objectives and the methods of implementation of the Board of Education and the local community agencies which administered the project. Criticized are the diversity of the program objectives, the lack of provision for a specified evaluation, and the handicaps posed by "avoidable problems." The most damaging problems were (1) lateness of funding; (2) multiplicity of goals; (3) friction between the Board and some of the agencies; and (4) lack of coordination between the various components of the NYC programs. Also noted is the low priority given to evaluation of the program's effectiveness. (NH)

ED029938

08153E

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I

EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67

EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED INSCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES DURING THE SUMMER 1967

By E. Belvin Williams and Robert S. Tannenbaum

November 1967

UD 008 153

The Center For Urban Education
33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

EDUCATIONAL ENRICHMENT FOR DISADVANTAGED INSCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES DURING THE SUMMER 1967

E. Belvin Williams and Robert S. Tannenbaum

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the summer of 1967.

Conducted under subcontract by the Behavioral Sciences Center.

ED 008 153

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director
George Weinberg, Title I Coordinator

November 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BOARD OF EDUCATION'S OBJECTIVES OF PROGRAM	2
OBJECTIVES OF PARTICIPATING AGENCIES	3
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM	10
PROBLEMS OF DIVERSITY OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	11
OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION	12
OVERVIEW	16
FINDINGS	19
APPENDIX A: Tables (Included in the text)	
APPENDIX B: Instruments	B1
APPENDIX C: Staff List	C1

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. Description of the Program

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a federal program designed to serve disadvantaged youths between the ages of 16 and 22. Since the summer of 1965 the New York City Board of Education has been providing, under Title I, a summer Educational Enrichment Program for Inschool Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees. The official Board of Education proposal described the function and goals of the Educational Enrichment Program for Neighborhood Youth Corps during the summer of 1967 as follows:

> The Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees will be given a work assignment for four hours each day funded by O.E.O. and an educational program for two hours under Title I ESEA. The enrollees will be in attendance at one of the neighborhood facilities for 30 hours per week for nine weeks. For the most part, the educational program will be ungraded and of a remedial nature. It will be built around what the enrollees are doing in their work assignments. This was successfully tried with a small group of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees in the Board of Education's program in the summer of 1965. It was continued in the 1966 summer program and received widespread attention and approval. In most cases, these programs will be conducted in neighborhood facilities of the cooperating Community Action Agencies which serve all youth of the city, whether from public or private schools (Haryou, Y.I.A., Community

Progress Centers). The enrollees' work assignment will involve them as recreational aides, neighborhood rehabilitation aides, clerical aides and nurse's aides.

A school librarian using a mobile unit will be assigned to the project to bring books and materials to and from the centers in which these programs will be located.

It is estimated that 115 teachers-in-charge and teachers will service approximately 6,000 students who will receive standard Neighborhood Youth Corps stipends. Title I will fund only the educational component.

CHAPTER II

Board of Education's Objectives of Program

The major objectives of the program are:

1. To provide intensive educational enrichment for disadvantaged youth enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps for two months during the summer. The youth participating will return to school with improved skills and new objectives seeing school as a necessary link in a progression to a vocational goal.

2. An additional objective is to bring the teacher into a massive Community Action Program which would result in greater understanding of the neighborhood and the disadvantaged child.

Objectives of Participating Agencies

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program is administered through a variety of local community agencies. The educational program was run by both agency and Board personnel. The agencies participating in the Board of Education's educational enrichment phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program were:

Manhattan: Mobilization for Youth
New York Mission Society
United Neighborhood Houses
Lower West Side Community Progress Center
Haryou-Act
United Block Association

Brooklyn: Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth In Action
Fort Greene Community Progress Center
South Brooklyn Community Progress Center
Williamsburg Community Progress Center
Brownsville East New York Community Progress Center
Brownsville Community Council

Bronx: South Bronx Community Progress Center
Hunts Point Community Progress Center
Morrisania Community Progress Center

Queens: South Jamaica Community Progress Center, Building #22
Qualicap Community Progress Center

The participating community agencies formulated their own objectives for the educational enrichment phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

Following are the statements of goals and description of procedures for implementing the program of ten of the participating agencies; there were eighteen in all in the program.

A. United Block Association

Objectives:

1. To work toward the mastery of minimum essentials of grammar and correct usage. To project the need for reading skill as a basic academic tool. To help pupils master fundamental concepts of math. To improve the ability to communicate with others in oral and written expression.

2. To prepare "dropouts" for High School Equivalency Exam.

3. To further the business training courses our students received at Columbia University.

4. To prepare youth academically and socially for their lifetime occupations.

Implementation:

1. Individual instruction.

2. Panel discussion.

3. Field Trips.

4. Critical and recreational reading - pupils reading short news selections, biographical sketches, autodriver's manual. Motivate with pivotal questions.

5. Problem solving.

6. Vocabulary development, written vocabulary drill.

Statistics on United Block Association Neighborhood Youth Corps Program:

# of Teachers: Board of Education - 5
Agency - 5

Approximate number of enrollees in program: 70

B. Mobilization For Youth

Objectives:

The improvement of the teenagers' self-image and the development of their psychological adequacy for employment and life in our society. In the short run to:

1. Provide money for the enrollees;
2. Get enrollees off the streets;
3. Build work habits.

Implementation:

Provide employment in meaningful, "important" job, under professional supervision - in a situation where there is respect for the individual as an individual and for his talents and potentials.

Note: Mobilization for Youth staff communicated to the evaluators that last year they were very dissatisfied with the remediation programs included and therefore there was to be no remediation (or almost none) this year. Only four Board of Education teachers were used in their program and these were involved in helping the teenagers teach English to newly arrived Puerto Rican families.

C. Greater New York Community Council

Objectives:

1. To develop a healthy attitude toward self.
2. To change attitude toward school and teachers - to develop a healthy attitude toward both.

3. To develop a healthy attitude toward vocation.

4. To raise level of expectation for future vocation.

5. To relate to people positively.

Implementation:

1. Individual conferences.

2. Group discussion.

3. Tutoring.

4. Guest speakers.

5. Trips.

6. Audiovisual aids.

D. Lower West Side Community Progress Center

Objectives:

1. Provide review of material with which the students have not been successful.

2. Provide preview of subject areas with which they will be involved.

3. Raise reading levels for low level readers.

4. Through instruction reduce instances of failure in subject matter for the following school year.

Implementation:

The 300 enrollees who are not assigned to jobs in city agencies or in community action programs will be released from their jobs for one hour per day to attend tutorial sessions in areas of academic weakness. The following methods will be used:

1. Small groups - a program, if possible, where 10 students will be assigned to one teacher.

2. Individualized instruction.

3. Team teaching within subject areas.

E. New York City Mission Society

Objectives:

1. To improve self-image of the enrollee.

2. Raise achievement levels in reading and math - to make enrollee aware of his needs in these subjects.

3. To show the enrollee steps to be taken for his improvement.

4. To be able to show the enrollee his own progress.

5. To set up expected goals for enrollee and help him achieve them.

Implementation:

1. Four hours of instruction in remedial reading and in math weekly.

2. Groups no larger than five.

3. Flow sheet approach in both areas.

4. Extensive testing.

F. Brownsville - East New York Community Progress Center

Objectives:

1. To provide enrollees with remediation.

2. To increase proficiency in reading and math.

3. To train students in job skills.

4. To broaden students' understanding of their heritage.

In general, to provide enrollees with pay, work experience, and remediation; to ensure that they continue their education; and to encourage higher education.

Implementation:

1. Individual tutoring.
2. Group discussion.
3. Group tutoring.
4. Sociodrama.
5. Work Experience.

G. Haryou-Act

Objectives:

Cultural enrichment for youths of Harlem area. To motivate youths to develop a need and a desire for learning.

Implementation:

Specific approaches are interlocked with broad aims and will be determined by teacher's observations.

H. Hunts Point Community Progress Center

Objectives:

1. To evolve an interest in further developing socially acceptable and meaningful activities.
2. To improve attitudes toward formalized learning through improving basic skills.

3. To develop a better rapport between enrollees and educators, to enable them to exploit to the maximum opportunities for better self-development.

4. To furnish opportunities to the enrollees for developing the necessary criteria enabling them to make more valid self-directed decisions.

5. Improve interest in continuing schooling.

6. To develop in staff members greater insight and understanding of the neighborhood and of the disadvantaged child.

Implementation:

1. Group discussion.

2. Testing and remedial instruction.

3. Explaining (to develop awareness of) the opportunities offered by school and the society as they relate to the furthering of an enrollee's immediate goals and future achievements.

4. Group guidance and individual counseling.

I. United Neighborhood Houses

Objectives:

1. To identify in-school enrollees who are in the greatest need of educational services.

2. To provide educational services to enrollees in reading, mathematics, and English - raise reading and math levels as much as possible.

3. To try to help enrollees stay in school.

4. Make enrollees aware of community resources to enable them to gain access to them.

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

Five hundred enrollees were tested at the beginning of the summer program. In the second week of July, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Intermediate form was administered. All of the lower 250 enrollees fell below the 7th grade reading level, or at least two years below their actual grade level. It is hoped that, by the end of the program, these youth will be up to the 8th grade level or above, the minimum requirement for high school graduation. The concentration of the program is on reading, though there is some work in math, the sciences, etc. There is individual tutoring for nonreaders.

The materials used in this program vary but are mostly Board of Education supplied. Widely used is the SRA reading kit which has proved to be extremely effective. Paperback books are also supplied in many areas of interest and in the past have proven to be well accepted and used by the youths. Other materials include work games, individually constructed materials, etc.

In addition the aims were:

1. To give enrollees experience in an actual job situation.

2. Offer opportunity to earn money.

3. Teaching triad program (college students aiding enrollees in teaching elementary school children).

4. Experimental program of programmed instruction.

The agency served about 1500 enrollees.

J. Fort Greene Community Progress Center

An attempt was made:

1. To provide enrollees with training related to their summer work assignment.

2. To provide enrollees, through work-oriented remediation, with basic educational skills.

3. To instill awareness of and pride in one's own cultural heritage.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS OF DIVERSITY OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

From reading the objectives stated by the Board of Education and by the individual agencies it is apparent that unity of purpose is lacking. Most of the agencies involved have strong philosophical and professional orientations of their own and frequently differ in their approaches to common problems.

From the point of view of the evaluation, this diversity of program objectives and methods of implementation represents a serious problem. This situation existed during the program's previous year of operation and was clearly identified in the 1966 evaluation conducted by B. Peck et. al.

Apparently no official accommodation was made by any of the cooperating institutions since then. However, the fact that the Board of

Education elected to participate again with the agencies in the program seems to imply tacit acceptance by the Board of the diversity of program objectives.

While it is true that this disparity among the goals is essentially not a qualititative one, because the ultimate goal of all the agencies and of the Board of Education is (in the long run) to improve their clients' potential for a productive, personally satisfying, and socially useful life, the differences in approach did cause some serious problems. Lack of clearly defined and agreed upon objectives added to friction between Board of Education and agency personnel, impairing efficiency, and hampering evaluative efforts.

CHAPTER V

OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation was to determine to what extent the program in question achieved its stated objectives. However, the variety of program objectives was not known to the evaluating team in advance, but was encountered during the course of the evaluation.

Since the previous year's evaluation discussed this difficulty fully, the evaluators had assumed the situation would be rectified in the program's second year of functioning. What the evaluators had anticipated was to conduct an evaluation as outlined in the official Board of Education program proposal. That document specified the evaluation objectives and measures to be used as follows:

Objectives	Method of Assessment
1. To determine the extent to which enrollees have received tutoring in the fundamental academic skills.	a. Teacher questionnaires b. Enrollee questionnaires and interview c. Reading and mathematics tests on a sample of the enrollees
2. To determine enrollee's growth in attitude toward school and its relation in achieving vocational goals.	a. Teacher rating scale b. Enrollee questionnaire and interview
3. To determine the extent of enrollee's appreciation of the need for improving his attitude toward self and society.	a. Teacher appraisal b. Enrollee interview
4. Reactions of supervisory and instructional participants in the program.	a. Questionnaires and interviews.

These goals and procedures are appropriate and adequate--unfortunately no provisions were made to enable their execution.

As in the previous year (see program evaluation for summer of 1966 by B. Peck et. al.), no provisions had been built into the program's operation to allow for collecting of material and data for evaluation. Arrangements for an evaluation had to be made while the program was already underway, so that no before-and-after testing techniques could be utilized. Lateness of funding (discussed later in the report) created a situation of severe time pressure--it did not allow for the normal amount of time for evaluation design, it did not allow for any pre-planning on the part both of program administrators and evaluators.

Some of the agencies did administer diagnostic and/or before-and-after reading ability tests to some or all of their enrollees. Unfortunately--because the data were processed too late for inclusion in evaluation or because of a lack of agency cooperation--the evaluating team did not have access to these data.

As a result of these circumstances, the evaluation utilized only a portion of the methods outlined by the Board of Education. Even with this limitation, the evaluation meets most of the objectives spelled out in the Board of Education proposal. However, it depends on data that is qualitative rather than quantitative--that is, data based on observation, personal interviews, and respondents' estimates of the effectiveness of various features rather than on precise measurements or performance tests of any kind.

A. Description of Method

Eighteen agencies participated in the educational enrichment program for disadvantaged in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees. Of these, two were visited and studied intensively during the course of the study, and all agencies were surveyed via questionnaires.

Evaluators visited various sites at which the educational program was conducted. They conducted personal interviews with a total of 55 enrollees, crew chiefs, and agency and Board of Education program staff at all levels.

The evaluators also attended the weekly meetings of all the curriculum specialists engaged in the program. A teacher questionnaire was developed and mailed to the 110 Board of Education teachers involved in

the educational enrichment phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program. (Curriculum specialists were not included in the mailing.) Completed questionnaires were received from 31.6 per cent (39) of the teachers.

The questionnaire sent to the 18 participating agencies covered the areas of program objectives and planned method of implementation. Replies were received from nine agencies.

By these means, information was gathered on the following areas:

1. Teachers' estimates of academic gains made by students through participation in the program.

2. Estimates of improvement in students' attitude toward schooling in general.

3. Teachers' goals for the enrollees.

4. Courses/subjects actually taught by the teachers.

5. Problems encountered during the course of the program.

6. Teachers' perception of program's strengths and weaknesses.

7. Appraisal of the program's effectiveness and its strengths and shortcomings by selected agency and Board of Education personnel through personal informal interviews and their overall reactions to the program.

An analysis of the data collected is presented in the following chapters.

Chapter IV

OVERVIEW

It is fairly difficult to assess the effectiveness of the educational enrichment phase of the Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program -- as it is with almost any special action program. Some of the positive results of this program (and similar ones) fall into the area of intangibles; i.e., results that are not measurable, not quantifiable in any precise manner.

Consequently, the evaluation had to deal with material that is by its nature subjective. The evaluators were most conscious of this reality, and made every effort to achieve balance and objectivity to the degree that this is possible.

The 1967 Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program serviced approximately 40,000 youths in the New York City area. Of these 5,000 were enrolled in the Board of Education educational enrichment phase of the program.

In the educational program, the enrollees were offered a remarkable variety and scope of subjects and activities. Depending on their needs, the enrollees were offered courses in remedial reading and arithmetic, in biology, poetry, physics; world, Negro and American history; language arts, industrial arts, current events, social studies, geometry, typing, Spanish, vocabulary development and English literature, among others. The enrollees also partici-

pated in special programs and projects involving playwriting and play production, fashion shows, field trips, parades, exhibits of African fabrics, as well as specialized films and lectures.

The evaluation might be summarized briefly as follows:

A. The program (1) filled a definite need, (2) was viable, (3) was moderately successful, (4) contained potential for future success.

B. The functioning and effectiveness of the program were severely handicapped by a number of avoidable problems. Probably the most damaging of these was:(1) lateness of funding. Other handicapping features were: (2) multiplicity of goals -- which seemed to be greater than what might be deemed desirable for program flexibility; (3) friction between the Board of Education and some of the administering agencies; (4) lack of coordination between the various elements of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and educational programs, sometimes occasioned by poor planning and/or lack of communication, and sometimes by negative attitudes on the part of the agency.

For many youngsters this program provided a positive experience with education. For a segment of the population, it provided the motivation to continue and complete their schooling and/or to make meaningful vocational plans. For the majority, the program offered something of value in academic, educational terms. For the great bulk it offered something of value emotionally, in as much as the very existence of the program was evidence that somebody cared.

Beyond these generalities -- it is much easier to specify the program's shortcomings than its achievements, because in interviews and informal discussions program personnel tended to focus their comments on problems.

The evaluation relied mainly on interview and observational data. The first part of the findings deals with material obtained through personal and informal interviews. A shortcoming of such data is that the respondents are often problem-oriented -- that is, they don't address themselves to what is functioning smoothly but rather to the problems they are confronting -- which is the reason the section on Findings opens with "Program Handicaps."

Chapter VII

FINDINGS

Program Handicaps

A. Lateness of Fundings

The two prongs of the program -- Neighborhood Youth Corps and Board of Education educational enrichment -- were funded through different federal agencies. In both cases funding was delayed -- and was not actually confirmed until just a few weeks before the program was to be in operation.

Until funding was confirmed, all plans and commitments in the program had to be considered tentative. Recruiting, staffing, training, screening, and planning were postponed to the point that, when carried out, they could not be given the attention necessary to insure the success of the program. In effect, the lateness of funding at the very onset of the program, generated a chain of problems each of which tended to breed other difficulties.

1. Recruiting and Hiring of Teachers and Agency Staff

The letter to the district superintendents announcing the Board of Education In-School Enrichment Program and instructing them to "Please forward the application to persons who wish to apply for one of the positions in the program and whom you or a principal wish to recommend (see Appendix B)," was dated May 30, 1967. Formal re-

cruitment did not begin until June, by which time most teachers had already made summer plans.

The letter also stated the "applications must be returned... by June 10, 1967, and (applicants will be notified) by June 26, 1967 (see Appendix B)." Thus,the recruiting and applying procedures were allowed ten days, and the entire processing period was limited to 16 days. Comments made by program personnel to the evaluation staff indicated clearly that this was insufficient time to evaluate properly, as well as process, applicants for 125 positions. Under these circumstances, little more than a cursory appraisal of applications could be given and no in-depth interviewing could be conducted. Similar problems were encountered by the participating agencies.

One agency began receiving unsolicited applications as early as January from all parts of the nation. Two staff members took on the task of replying and interviewing on their own time, in addition to their regular duties. No compensation was available for this work as the project was not yet funded. It is the evaluator's conclusion that success of the program as a whole is largely dependent upon preliminary activities such as these, which were not allowed for under the present financial and administrative structure.

2. Payment Delays to Enrollees and Program Personnel

Again due to lateness of funding, salary checks for both staff members and enrollees were delayed in some cases as long as four weeks. There was also confusion about the compensation to be received. These

difficulties in running the program did not help to foster a feeling of confidence among the enrollees. It also put the staff in a curious position -- the people engaged in "teaching" these youths how to cope with the world were themselves placed in a position of seeming helplessness and powerlessness when it came to helping their charges get their checks on time.

3. Inadequate Screening Procedures

The delay in initiating the program resulted in cursory and inadequate screening procedures of potential enrollees. According to the criteria for enrollment, out-of-school and non-poverty students were ineligible for the program. In some cases, enrollees were accepted who were not qualified under the regulatory criteria. Figures reported to the evaluation staff by one agency give the following results: of the 35 sites, 31 had "out of school" enrollees; in all, 338 of the 1,373 participants did not officially belong in the program because they did not meet the "in-school" criterion.

Similarly, hasty screening was conducted with regard to family income level. The evaluation staff was told that a broad interpretation was being given to the term "poverty level." Whereas the reason given for this liberal interpretation was "the high cost of living in New York City," in actual fact officials of the project related that lack of time and money prevented them from thoroughly checking income figures.

The problem of insufficient time was exemplified in detail by

one agency. Approximately three days were available to process over 2,000 applicants. The processing was done by a staff with the equivalent of two days training, which did not include any type of counseling instruction. Due to the number of applicants and the small size of the staff, each interview was limited to approximately twenty minutes. The major part of this brief period was devoted to filling in the required forms.

Inadequate lead time resulted in job sites not being selected in time, and in screening personnel having only a sketchy knowledge of those sites already established. No standardized testing was performed to assist in placing applicants (e.g., interest or skills tests). Placement was handled primarily by newly hired crew chiefs (college students), some of whom had no previous experience either with the program or with teenagers from economically impoverished backgrounds.

The difficulties created during the screening period were such that 25 to 50 per cent of the time of some programs was spent trying to straighten out problems generated during the initial stage.

4. Insufficient Lead Time for Establishing Job Sites and Work Programs

Of primary importance to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is the job site. The statements made by agency personnel, concerning the job site were, "It must be carefully sought out;"[1] "It must

---

[1]Personal Communication from Neighborhood Youth Corps Personnel to the evaluation team during interviews.

be structured and well supervised;"[2] "There must be one and only one person from the job site who is in charge of the enrollees--to whom they can relate--and he must be carefully picked;"[3] "The crew chief must fit the site"[4] -- all point out a number of essentials to be considered. But the actual time allotted to the task of choosing job sites was from one to two weeks. The consensus of Neighborhood Youth Corps personnel interviewed was that more time and attention should be given to this task.

Due to the rush to meet the pre-program deadlines, some enrollees were unable to get jobs until several weeks after the program started. Others reported unsatisfactory experiences at their job sites due to improper assignment and lack of organization. For example, a number of enrollees were employed in housing projects. Their duties were to have been the supervision of recreational activities, but in fact turned out to be primarily janitorial. Difficulty in relating to supervisors and in interpersonal relations was also reported. For those who had bad work experiences, little if any progress was observed in educational areas.

5. Insufficient Time for Training Staff

Mention has been made of the insufficient time available to prepare staff members for screening and placement. It should be

---

[2]Personal Communication from Neighborhood Youth Corps Personnel to the evaluation team during interviews.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

noted also that there was not enough time for training crew chiefs (about three days), program supervisors (about three days), teachers (one meeting), and teachers-in-charge (two meetings).

The problem of multiplicity of goals has already been discussed in the introductory chapter. It is recognized that diversity of goals may not actually be a shortcoming in the program and therefore cannot be dismissed categorically. It must be remembered that purely academic approaches have not worked for many of these students who have for years been exposed to "traditional" education and responded by falling below national norms in academic areas. Tailoring a program to meet the specific needs and aspirations of enrollee groups may indeed be a worthy approach, although it may not permit mass improvement in any one subject.

However, the one area in which disparity of program objectives was of definite detriment in the operation of the program (apart from evaluating it) was in creating or adding to already existing friction between Board of Education teachers and the administering agencies. In other words, diversity of goals represented a handicap to the program's functioning when the various staffs were following different objectives, working at cross purposes.

A. <u>Negative Attitudes Toward Board of Education or Attitudes of Participating Agencies</u>

A frequently recurring theme in interviews with and conferences

among program personnel was the hostility (explicit or just-below-the-surface) of some of the agencies toward the Board of Education--and, by extension, toward the educational enrichment program.

The negative attitudes of the agencies reflected in some measure the prevailing attitudes toward the Board of Education in the communities where these agencies function. The lack of acceptance of the Board of Education by some segments of these communities is a known fact. What the genesis of such attitudes is is not relevant to the present evaluation--what is relevant is that friction between the agencies and the Board of Education served to disrupt the flow of communication and generally to hamper the functioning of the educational program.

The local agencies generally feel that they are "closer" to the communities than many other social and service organizations. Thus, according to the agencies, even if an agency did not have a negative attitude toward the Board, it was problematic for the agency to work with, or express support for the Board because such an association might weaken the agency's position in the community. (The evaluators are not taking the position that that would have been the case. They are only reporting what seemed to be operative in the situation.)

Another consideration that appeared to motivate some agencies was the willingness to encourage a strong local presence of the Board of Education. It is difficult to assess any individual's

motives, and it seems more difficult to assess those of the agencies involved. What was observable were a few successful attempts to downgrade the Board of Education's phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, with the result that the administering agency maintained complete control and received complete credit for all achievement.

The evaluators do not wish to imply the agencies acted out of "selfish motives." Most agency staff members encountered were highly motivated, hard working, dedicated individuals. It appeared that all agencies acted in good faith--that is, they genuinely sought to do what, from their point of view, was best for their clients. But their conception of this goal did not embrace the participation of the Board of Education.

From the discussion thus far it might appear that the agency-Board of Education hostility was a one-way transaction. That was not the case. Some Board of Education personnel entered the program with matching negative attitudes toward the local agencies. These persons prejudged the situation in that they <u>expected</u> the agency personnel they would have to work with to be deficient in a variety of ways. There was a small proportion of Board of Education teachers who rejected the agency staff since they did not perceive the staff as being professional educators. From the point of view of this group of teachers, the strong motivation and high ideals of the agency people were no substitute for professional

training and educational experience. (This lack of esteem aggravated by occasional personality clashes, led to several conflicts in the educational program.) To the evaluators, this aspect of the program represented a regrettable waste of human resources. Two parties with basically the same objective--the improvement, socially, emotionally and academically, of the program enrollees--were in some instances embroiled in a conflict over means to this end.

But there is a further piece to be added to the picture: that the Board of Education is following a wise and beneficial course by taking its resources to the community and placing them at the community's disposal. The following comment, made by one of the program teachers, expresses this point eloquently:

> The most impressive result, as I see it, will be the impact this program has made upon the community agencies. The hostility in the community toward the Board of Education is an open secret. To the degree that this program has come into contact with the community through its agencies we have succeeded in presenting something of a different image. There are flaws in this program that will draw due criticism. In spite of this, the response of the agencies indicated by their cooperation and stated approval has been positive. An aspect of this reevaluation of the Board has been the willingness of the teachers to adapt and to give of themselves freely and far beyond the expectations of the agencies. In addition, this indication of the concern of the Board for community development has been most salutary.

C. Relevance of Job Assignment to Educational Program

Given its mandate, this evaluation is not concerned with the noneducational aspects of Neighborhood Youth Corps Program. However,

it was observed that successful job placement bore a positive relationship to enrollees' participation in the educational program. In those instances where the job assignments were unsatisfactory or unsuitable, the enrollees either failed to continue in the education program, or continued without motivation or interest. For the success of the educational program, as well as for the benefit of the enrollees, it is desirable therefore that the vocational assignments be made with great care. Adequate time for setting up job sites, training crew chiefs, screening applicants' interests, etc. are essential in achieving that end.

D. Educational Materials

The most often and most positively mentioned item in the program was the availability of paperback books. Beyond that there were no materials used universally in the program. One observation in this regard seems worthy of note:

The quality of educational materials should be more carefully reviewed, particularly those readings designed to describe the historical contributions of various ethnic groups. A positive attitude and good will are not sufficient as a substitute for competent scholarship in the areas of American Negro and Puerto Rican history. All renditions of the historical events relevant to these groups are not equal in literary content. If students are to gain some appreciation of the contributions made by histo-

rical figures and the circumstances in which Negro or Puerto Rican notables have labored, then the written materials should be (1) worth reading, (2) accurate and (3) more than a superficial presentation.

E. Questionnaire Results

Questionnaires were mailed to all 108 Board of Education teachers involved in the educational phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Of these, 37 teachers (34 per cent) returned completed questionnaires, and this section of findings presents the tabulated data obtained from them.

Judging by the responses of the teachers assigned to the program, it can be reported that in spite of its shortcomings, the educational program was successful in providing something of value to the majority of the enrollees. This finding may be accepted even though the teachers' judgments of the program's effectiveness were perforce subjective, and probably influenced by their own involvement in it.

Asked "In how many of your students did you observe academic gains during the summer?" almost half of the 37 teachers (46.9 per cent) report gains in upwards of 50 per cent of the students, and an additional 31 per cent report gains in between 31 to 50 per cent of their students (see Table 1). Only 12 per cent judged that less than 30 per cent of their students made any academic gains. More

than half (53 per cent) of these estimates are based on the students' performance on some tests, which the teachers (but not the evaluators) had access to. In addition, more than half of the teachers mention interviews with their students as the basis of their estimate. The bulk (73 per cent) also mention personal observation as evidence on which they based their estimate.

Table 1

Teachers' Estimate of Per Cent of Students Who Made Academic Gains During the Summer Program

Per Cent of Students	Per Cent of Teachers Estimating
0 - 15	6.2
16 - 30	6.2
31 - 50	31.3
51 - 70	18.8
71 - 90	21.9
90 or over	6.2
Can't estimate/ No answer	9.4

Evidence on Which Estimate Was Based, By Per Cent*	
Personal Observation	73.3
Test Results	53.3
Interview with Student	56.7
Evaluation by Student	3.3

*Column adds to more than 100 per cent because teachers relied on more than one kind of evidence.

When asked "In how many of the enrollees did you observe improvement of attitude toward school, academic work, remaining in school, etc?" all the teachers report noticing such improvement in at least a portion of their students (see Table 2. Five out of ten teachers estimated that between 16 and 50 per cent of their students improved their attitude as a result of the participation in the summer program. One out of ten felt they could not make an estimate. Most of the teachers (82 per cent) based their estimates on "interviews" (in most cases probably on informal conversations), supported by personal observation (73 per cent).

The estimates made by the teachers appear reasonably realistic--only 6 per cent claim that over 90 per cent of their students made academic gains, and about one fourth say that over 90 per cent improved their attitude toward school and teachers. But the teachers did feel that sizeable proportions of their students experienced these benefits.

Table 2

Teachers' Estimates of Per Cent of Students Whose Attitude Toward School and Teachers Has Improved During the Summer

Per Cent of Students	Per Cent of Teachers Estimating
0 - 15	--
16 - 30	16.2
31 - 50	18.9
51 - 70	13.5
71 - 90	21.7
90 and over	18.9
Can't estimate/ No answer	10.8

Evidence on Which Estimate Was Based, by Per Cent*	
Personal Observation	73.5
Test Result	8.8
Interview with Student	82.4
Evaluation by Student	5.9

* Column adds to more than 100 per cent because teachers relied on more than one kind of evidence.

About half of the teachers felt that, relative to their regular students, the enrollees were highly motivated to learn (see Table 3). Only 8 per cent thought the enrollees' motivation was low in comparison to students they taught in regular session, and almost three out of ten teachers considered both student groups the same in this respect.

Table 3

Teachers' Appraisal of Enrollees' Motivation in Comparison to Students in Regular Session

Choice of Rating	Per Cent of Teachers Estimating
Very High	10.8
High	37.9
Average	27.0
Low	5.4
Very Low	2.7
Some Very High, some Low	8.1
Could not compare	8.1

The diversity of program goals among the participating agencies is partly reflected in the responses of the teachers to the question, "What were your goals for the enrollees you saw?"

Less than half of the teachers named as their goals improvement of reading ability, about one-third improvement in mathematics, about one-fourth counseling the enrollees about educational opportunities, 21 per cent mentioned improvement of enrollees' attitudes toward schooling, another 21 per cent aiding in strengthening enrollees' egos and positive self-image, etc.

Table 4 shows the per cent of teachers who mentioned each goal, and also shows each item in relationship to all goals mentioned. This second way of presenting the data reveals even more clearly the absence of any single dominant objective.

Not everything about a project can be determined from its stated goals. It maybe possible that some of the teachers were not even familiar with the official Board of Education objectives and adopted as their goals those of the agency with which they worked--or possibly some teachers may have formulated their own goals.

Table 4

Teachers' Ratings of Most Important Goals

Goal	Per Cent of Teachers Mentioning This Goal	Per Cent of All Goals Mentioned
Improve reading abilities of enrollees	47.8%	21.5%
Improve basic math abilities of enrollees	31.6	14.3
Counsel enrollees re: educational opportunities	26.4	11.9
Help build the enrollees' egos and self-images	21.0	9.5
Improve enrollee attitudes towards school, teachers, etc.	21.0	9.5
Give enrollees vocational information	10.5	4.8
Encourage and develop group communication	10.5	4.8
Teach Negro history and culture	10.5	4.8
Teach current events	10.5	4.8
Improve enrollees' ability to organize ideas	7.9	3.5
Miscellaneous*	23.7	10.7

*Give work experience, have enrollees earn money, teach about U.S. government, learn how to take tests, learn to use a library, teach Spanish culture, teach industrial arts, teach typing and clerical practice.

Table 5

Subjects Taught In Educational Enrichment Program By Teachers Surveyed

Subject	Percent
Reading (Net)	65.6
Reading skills	25.0
Remedial reading	18.8
Reading comprehension	18.8
Language arts	15.6
Mathematics (Net)	62.5
Basic arithmetic math	40.6
Remedial math	9.4
Algebra	18.8
Geometry	9.4
Negro history & culture	18.8
Vocabulary development	15.6
Social counseling, guidance	12.5
Educational counseling, guidance (goals, study habits, test preparation, etc.)	12.5
Social studies/ current events & problems	12.5
Creative writing/ written expression, English composition	12.5
American history	9.4
Career information, vocational guidance	9.4
English literature	6.3
Biology	6.3
Physics	6.3
Discussion techniques	6.3
Poetry	6.3
Spanish (as a foreign lang.)	6.3
Health/hygiene	6.3
Economics	3.1
World history	3.1
World geography	3.1
Music	3.1
Negro drama	3.1
Consumer education	3.1
Industrial arts	3.1
Spanish (as first lang.)	3.1
Clerical skills	3.1
Typing	3.1
Office Procedures	3.1
Taught students how to teach Spanish	3.1

In practice, however, there was somewhat less anarchy than would appear from a reading of the objectives. An analysis of the teachers' listing of the subjects they actually taught (see Table 5) shows that the majority (65.6 per cent) taught reading in one form or another--25 per cent list reading skills, 18.8 remedial reading, 18.8 per cent reading comprehension, and 15.6 per cent language arts. In addition, 15.6 per cent taught vocabulary development and usage, 12.5 per cent taught English composition or creative writing, and 6.3 per cent English literature.

Over six out of ten of the teachers also taught some form of mathematics, 40.6 per cent taught basic math (arithmetic), 18.8 per cent taught algebra, 94 per cent taught geometry, and another 9.4 per cent taught remedial math.

In addition to these courses, the teachers taught an impressive and varied array of other courses. About 20 per cent taught Negro history and culture, a few taught physics, others taught poetry, discussion techniques, biology, and social studies. Some used class time for vocational counseling or for educational and/or social guidance. The subjects taught ranged from basic to advanced, from academic to utilitarian, depending on the needs of the situation and the orientation of the administering agency. There was no reason to doubt that, to some degree, all were worthwhile and helpful to the enrollees' development. However, the evaluation was not conceived to deal with such a diversity in subjects, and

consequently must depend on the teacher's evaluation of the effectiveness of all of these activities (discussed in Table 1).

Most of the responding teachers (32 out of 37) had taught or tutored in the program, at least for part of their time (see Table 6). Only half of the teachers surveyed named only teaching or tutoring duties. Twenty per cent had supervisory or administrative duties besides teaching, about 13 per cent named guidance and counseling activities in addition to teaching, and another 13 per cent were engaged in supervisory, liaison, and programming activities exclusively.

Table 6

Duties of Teachers in the Program

Teaching/ Tutoring	51.4
Teaching plus Guidance Counseling	13.5
Teaching plus Administrative/ Supervisory	21.6
Non-Teaching: Supervise, Set up Program, Library Liaison	13.5

The figures in Table 7 indicate that most of the teachers balanced their time fairly evenly among their nonteaching activities.

However, the time allowed for and spent on preparation (lines 1 and 2) appears somewhat inadequate by normal standards. During the regular school year, teachers get at least one preparation period for each five teaching periods, that is, 17 per cent of their total time was for preparation. Usually they needed (and often received) far more preparation time, especially for difficult or special assignments. During the summer program, 62.2 per cent of the teachers spent no more than 15 per cent of their time on class preparation, only 10 per cent spent more than 30 per cent of their time on preparation. This suggests that most teachers were not able to prepare thoroughly or that they were doing so on their own time.

Table 7

Proportion of Time Teachers Report Spending on Each Task

Duty	Per Cent of Time 0-15%	16-30%	31-50%	51-75%	75-100%	No Ans.
Class Preparation	62.2	16.2	5.4	2.7	2.7*	10.8
General Preparation	51.4	13.5	10.8	2.7	-0	21.6
Teaching (group)	16.2	5.4	13.5	27.1	18.9	18.9
Tutor (3 or fewer students)	37.9	27.0	8.1	10.8	8.1	8.1
Staff Conferences	62.2	13.5	8.1	2.7	2.7	10.8
Special Assignments	51.4	5.4	8.1	2.7	2.7	29.7

* These per cents are probably errors due to misreading of the question, since these respondents' lists totaled well over 100 per cent of their time.

The majority of the teachers (86.8 per cent) agreed that the areas with the most obvious deficiencies were those of reading skills (see Table 8). In addition, 56.7 per cent considered the enrollees most seriously deficient in mathematics, 26.6 per cent in spelling, and 23.4 in general social skills. Other areas of learning deficiency were mentioned by fewer teachers.

The absence of greater spelling deficiencies is surprising, but may be explained by their being overshadowed by the reading problems.

The relatively low number of "general social skills" deficiencies noted may also be somewhat misleading. Both teachers and curriculum specialists reported in interviews and conferences that many of the enrollees did not know how to dress for a job interview, let alone how to fill out a job application. Many more reported enrollees having problems in communicating in groups and even as individuals. In some cases, according to the interviews, these problems were very skillfully turned into the topics for lessons. This type of practical, job- and life-oriented teaching was evaluated very positively (by the teachers and curriculum specialists) and should be encouraged and expanded.

Table 8

Enrollees' Learning Deficiencies Considered Most Obvious by Teachers

Area of Deficiency	Per Cent of Teachers Reporting this Deficiency
Reading skills	86.8
Mathematics	56.7
Spelling	26.6
General social skills	23.4
Speech	10.0
Writing	6.7
Study Habits	3.3
Map reading	3.3
Measuring	3.3
Personal hygiene	3.3

Almost half of the teachers (45.9 per cent) reported that they did encounter difficulties with irregular attendance. In the majority of cases the teacher attributed this situation to shortcomings in the Board of Education's program coordination and/or because of negative attitudes on the part of agency personnel.

The specific reasons the teachers gave for enrollees' irregular attendance are listed in Table 9. It was not possible to ascertain

to what extent the teachers' perceptions and interpretations of the situation were objective or accurate. Their comments were confirmed by certain observations made by the evaluators throughout the course of the program, which are discussed elsewhere in this report.

Table 9

Problems With Irregular Attendance	Per Cent
Yes	45.9
No	54.1

Reason For Irregular Attendance	Per Cent*
Lack of coordination in agency/ Board of Education programming. Field trips	35.3
Enrollees personal & home problems	23.5
Changes in job sites	17.6
Lack of interest & erratic habits of enrollees	17.6
Confusion/ chaos/ poor planning by agency	23.5

* Column adds up to more than 100 per cent because the teachers relied on more than one kind of evidence.

The experiences of the teachers varied considerably with regard to enrollees' attendance (see Table 10). For example, some reported that they "saw daily" between one and ten students; others saw between 51 and 75 students daily. In some instances, teachers

reported great variation in attendance (discussed earlier); others saw the same number of students from beginning to the end of the program. By and large, it would appear that there was considerable fluctuation in attendance, judging by the figures in Table 10. For example, 62.2 per cent saw more than 75 students in the course of the program--but only 21.6 per cent saw this number of students "regularly," and only 32.5 per cent saw this number of students during a week.

The most typical teaching load was seeing 11 to 30 students per day--40.6 per cent of the teachers report these figures. Two out of ten teachers saw only between 1 and 10 students daily. Over one-third of the teachers saw upwards of 31 students on an average day.

Only 14.3 per cent of the teachers encountered no problems in the program (see Table 11). The great majority most often specified some difficulty in Board of Education-agency relations as the hampering problem. Lack of planning, cooperation and communications were highest on the list; other problems mentioned were lack of physical facilities and equipment, belated funding, improper screening of enrollees, poor materials, and poor teacher-student ratios.

Table 10

Number of Enrollees Taught During Summer

	1-10	11-30	31-50	51-75	over 75	No Answer
Total you saw during summer	10.8	10.8	8.1	5.4	62.2	2.7
Average you saw in a week	8.1	29.7	8.1	16.2	32.5	5.4
Number you saw more than once	13.5	27.0	5.4	10.8	37.9	5.4
Number you saw more than 5 times	24.3	18.9	16.2	2.7	29.8	8.1
Number you saw regularly	13.5	29.8	16.2	10.8	21.6	8.1
Number you saw daily	24.3	35.2	13.5	16.2	5.4	5.4
Maximum you saw in a day	21.6	27.0	21.6	10.8	8.1	10.8
Minimum you saw in a day	43.3	24.3	13.5	10.8	2.7	5.4
Average number you saw in a day	21.6	40.6	10.8	16.2	8.1	2.7

Table 11

What problems did you encounter that hampered your program?	Per Cent
None	14.3
Lack of communication, cooperation, poor or no coordination or planning between agency and Board of Education staff	42.9
Lack of facilities, equipment, space	31.4
Could not get organized/ equipped because of lateness of funding	14.3
Enrollees not properly screened/ informed; not interested in program	8.6
Materials not geared to enrollees age/ interests	5.7
Too many students per teacher; classes too large	5.7
Miscellaneous*	8.6

* Column adds to more than 100 per cent because of multiple responses.

The teachers' responses to the question, "What parts of your program did you find most successful and what do you recommend to be continued and/or expanded?" fall into an interesting pattern. (see Table 12). Several of the most frequently mentioned aspects or features of the program have much in common in that they are "not like regular school." To illustrate: about one-fourth of the teachers singled out small group teaching or tutoring as the best feature of the program. One-fifth specified discussion groups, 15 per cent felt that the shift away from a formal purely academic orientation to a job-oriented approach was responsible for their

program's success, and 9 per cent referred to the informality of the student-teacher encounter as being most effective. Together these four groups of comments represent about two-thirds of the teachers. Substantially, what they add up to is an endorsement for a less rigid educational approach for these students, and more individualized attention, with a focus on small group teaching.

Other program features considered most successful were the convenient availability of books--particularly in paperback (18.2 per cent), the teaching of Negro history and culture (15.2 per cent), the subject taught by the teacher (12.1 per cent), special lectures and presentations (12.1 per cent), remediation (9.1 per cent), and field trips (9.1 per cent).

Table 12

What Part(s) Of Your Program Did You Find Most Successful?	Per Cent
Small group teaching, tutoring	24.2
Discussion groups	21.0
Availability of paperbooks and library	18.2
Stress on practical, job education/ less formal approach	15.2
Teaching Negro history and culture	15.2
Educational/ social/ vocational counseling	12.1
Outside lectures, speakers, presentations	12.1
The subject taught (Spanish, clerical skills, language arts, etc.)	12.1
Informality of student-teacher encounter/relaxed settings	9.1
Field trips	9.1
Remedial part of program (reading, math)	9.1
Miscellaneous	15.2

BASE - 35

More than one-fifth of the teachers felt that no part of their program had been unsuccessful and therefore that nothing in it should be discarded (see Table 13). Almost three out of ten didn't answer this question. About 15 per cent felt that the greatest weakness of their program had been a poor teacher-student ratio--they opted for smaller class size. About one in ten said that the program was too short--and should be continued into the regular school year, or conducted throughout the year. Some felt that the lack of interest and enthusiasm among teachers was the program's greatest weakness, others felt there was not enough emphasis on the educational component of the program--and too much on the work assignment; others pointed out the poor planning on the part of the individual agencies (and some on the part of the Board of Education).

Judging from these responses, it would appear that outside of important administrative difficulties and, in some instances, too many students per teacher, the educational program itself was free of any serious intrinsic weaknesses--which is not to say of course that the program was as adequately focused as it should have been.

Table 13

What Parts Of Your Program Did You Find Least Successful?	Per Cent
None	23.1
Classes too large/ too many students per teacher	15.4
Program too short	11.5
Poor planning on part of agency	7.7
Unenthusiastic, disinterested teachers	7.7
Poor planning by Board of Education	3.8
Attendance poor/ remediation should be compulsory	3.8
Field trips	3.8
Diagnostic testing	3.8
Too much emphasis on work/ not enough on study	11.5
Miscellaneous	23.0
No Answer	29.7

BASE - 26

The generally positive attitudes of the responding teachers are best reflected in their replies to a question on the relative ease or difficulty of their summer assignment (see Table 14). About a third said they found teaching in the program about the same as in their regular assignment. Four out of ten found it somewhat or considerably easier. Only one-fourth rated their program assignments "more difficult" than their usual ones. None, however, felt it was "very hard."

The evaluators' overall impression of the program teachers was very positive. Many teachers gave much more of themselves than they were actually required to do. They were highly motivated and equipped with professional tools to translate their good intentions into reality. The program's success--to the extent that it achieved it--rests almost completely on the concentrated efforts of the individuals involved, staff members of the Board of Education and the participating agencies who managed to overcome what might have become crippling problems.

Table 14

Relative To Your Regular Teaching Assignment, How Did You Find This Experience?	Per Cent
Quite easy	10.8
Easier	29.8
About the same	32.4
More difficult	24.3
Very hard	--
No answer	2.7

Conclusions

It is the claim of this report that the character of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the City of New York has a degree of complexity which challenges the relevance of the objectives set

by any one participating agency, e.g., the Board of Education, the 18 participating community agencies, or the federal funding agency. Given the necessary interactions among the participating institutions, the probability that the objectives of any one group could survive unaffected much less serve as overall guidelines is quite small.

Program Objectives

The objectives of the participating groups were not well defined and, in a large number of the cases, not consonant with each other. Either this latitude of difference must be recognized and planned for, or objectives should be redefined in order to maximize cooperation and effectiveness. To have elements of a program pursuing diverse alternatives with little concern for the whole surely can not be said to be desirable or efficient. Continuation of such unrestrained activity can but invite increased ineffectiveness and social loss.

Citywide Coordination

Citywide coordination has been urged by many who have viewed the program and its operation. This recommendation bears repeating, however, since it is unlikely that any one institution or agency can hope to serve the host of community needs without the cooperation of others. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that

some mechanism that would at least insure a continuing dialogue be established, to keep problem areas contained and to explore jointly possible solutions.

Year-round Coordination

Earlier an instance of agency personnel "donating" their time as early as January was noted. Also reported was the minimal time alloted for recruitment of teachers. Other similar examples could have been cited that would serve to strengthen the recommendation that a year-round coordination staff be employed with adequate secretarial assistance to plan programs, hire and train staff, set up and initiate enrollee screening, guidance, and placement, and be responsible for citywide coordination.

Funding

Funding in every program is dependent on its importance. Institutions no less than individuals should be expected to meet their commitments within specified time periods. The penalty for lateness in funding is less obvious than some financial loss, but quite real to participants at all levels. The resulting animosities and lethargy due to doubt and distrust should not be dismissed casually as an unavoidable condition of such programs. Financial obligations should be strictly observed.

Training of Program Teachers

Teachers and teachers-in-charge need a longer training and orientation period. Many of the teachers had not previously worked with teenagers or with children from low-income neighborhoods. Specialization techniques need to be mastered to achieve success with such children, and two training sessions are clearly insufficient.

Curriculum Specialists

The role of the curriculum specialists bears more careful delineation. It is evident that in some cases specialists did function in the area of designing and procuring curricular materials. It is equally evident that some of these persons functioned as administrative assistants and provided needed professional experience in certain agencies. With such wide demands made on individuals in this area, there is indeed a special concern with getting competent and versatile persons. It is noted that a similar concern was raised by the previous investigations, i.e., Peck et al.

Job Assignments for Enrollees

Instances of poor job assignments were observed in the course of the study. The results of poor job placement were often quite damaging to the educational program. In view of these facts, it is strongly urged that a much more intensive enrollee screening procedure be employed in future programs and that the results of this screening

be used by professional counselors in placing enrollees in summer positions. The results should also be made available to the education staff to assist them in planning their phases of the program. The use of techniques such as interest and preference scales, I.Q. testing, and measurement of academic achievement and deficiency levels is suggested.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the program's effectiveness appears to be an item of relatively low priority in the overall planning. Noted by previous evaluators, as well as by the present team, is the lack of emphasis on viewing the longitudinal effects of the program on the behavior of the particular youngsters participating in it. No use of existing school records has been made or planned for either in the organization of the program or its evaluation. No effort has been made or planned to assess the impact of the program on the community e.g., assaying the effects on attitude of, and the economic contributions to, the local merchants who received the enrollees. No attempt is in evidence to assess whether the commercial skills learned by the enrollees are relevant to the job market to which they eventually must turn for their livelihood.

It is strongly recommended that the evaluation of the program's effectiveness be given serious thought prior to its beginning rather than after its initiation, as has been the case in summers of 1966 and 1967.

Appendix B

B 1

Cover Letter Sent with Questionnaire

Dear Neighborhood Youth Corps Teacher :

We are in the process of evaluating the educational portion of this summer's Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Would you please assist us by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it before September 18 in the enclosed envelope?

The results of this evaluation will be published in a report by the Board of Education which will be available on request.

Thank you,

E. Belvin Williams, Ph.D.
Director, Computer Center
Teachers College, Columbia University

Robert S. Tannenbaum
Associate in the Computer Center
Teachers College, Columbia University

encs.

B 2

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Office of the Executive Deputy Superintendent

May 30, 1967

To All District Superintendents

Re: Positions for Summer Work under the Neighborhood Youth Corps - In-School Enrichment Program

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please see enclosed circular of information on the program noted above. We would appreciate your help in obtaining personnel in your district. Please forward the applications to persons who wish to apply for one of the positions in this program and whom you or a principal wish to recommend.

Enclosed are forty applications and project descriptions which may be used for this purpose. Your office may reproduce additional copies if necessary. Please bear in mind, however, that there are only 125 pedagogical positions to be filled.

I have assigned Mr. Frederick H. Williams, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Integration and Human Relations, to the administration of this program. Applications must be returned to Mr. Emory A. Hightower, P.S.169 Manhattan, Project Coordinator, by June 10, 1967, and he will notify applicants by June 26, 1967.

Many thanks for your cooperation in this project.

Yours very truly,

(signed) NATHAN BROWN
Executive Deputy Superintendent

γ

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Name (optional) _____

Agency to which you were assigned: _____ Address _____

Teaching Site to which you were assigned: _____ Address _____

Briefly describe your duties: _____

_____

Please estimate the proportion of your weekly work time which was given to each of the following:

	0 - 15%	16 - 30%	31 - 50%	51 - 75%	75 - 100%
Class preparation	____	____	____	____	____
General preparation	____	____	____	____	____
Teaching (group)	____	____	____	____	____
Tutoring (three or fewer students)	____	____	____	____	____
Staff conferences	____	____	____	____	____
Special assignments	____	____	____	____	____

Was your supervisor employed by the Board of Education _____ or by the Agency _____?

What were your goals for the enrollees you saw? _____

_____

Please check the number of enrollees in each of the following categories:

	0 - 10	11 - 30	31 - 50	51 - 75	over 75
Total # you saw during the summer	____	____	____	____	____
Average # you saw in a week	____	____	____	____	____
Number you saw more than once	____	____	____	____	____
Number you saw more than five times	____	____	____	____	____
Number you saw regularly	____	____	____	____	____
Number you saw daily	____	____	____	____	____
Maximum # you saw in a day	____	____	____	____	____
Minimum # you saw in a day	____	____	____	____	____
Average # you saw in a day	____	____	____	____	____

Did you encounter problems with irregular attendance? _____ If yes, please describe:

_____

_____

Relative to your regular teaching assignment, how did you find this experience?
Quite easy _____ Easier _____ About the same _____ More difficult _____ Very Hard _____

Relative to students during the regular school session, these students' motivations for learning were: Very high ____ High ____ Average ____ Low ____ Very low _____

If you were actually teaching or tutoring, please answer all of the following questions, otherwise, skip to the ***.

Were students required to attend classes in order to be paid? Yes ____ No ____

Subjects you taught (be specific as to content, but be brief):

_____

_____

_____

In what areas were learning deficiencies most obvious?
Reading skills ___ Mathematics ___ General social skills ___ Spelling ___
Other(s) (specify) _____

In how many of your students did you observe academic gains during the summer?
0 - 15% ____ 16 - 30% ____ 31 - 50 % ____ 51 - 70% ____ 71 - 90% ____ over 90% ____

On what type of evidence do you base this conclusion? Personal observation ____
Test results ____ Interview with enrollee ____ Other (specify) _____

***In how many of the enrollees did you observe improvement of attitude toward school, academic work, remaining in school, etc.?
0 - 15% ____ 16 - 30% ____ 31 - 50% ____ 51 - 70% ____ 71 - 90% ____ over 90% ____

On what type of evidence do you base this conclusion? Personal observation ____
Test results ____ Interview with enrollee ____ Other (specify) _____

What problem(s) did you encounter that hampered your program? _____

_____

_____

What solution(s) (if any) did you find? _____

_____

_____

What part(s) of your program did you find most successful and what do you recommend be continued and/or expanded? _____

_____

What part(s) of your program did you find least successful and what do you recommend be discontinued and/or decreased? _____

_____

Participating Agencies

Lower West Side Community Progress Center
348 West 34th Street
New York, New York

Brownsville - East New York
Community Progress Center
505 Sutter Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Williamsburg Community Progress Center
815 Broadway
Brooklyn, New York

Morrisania Community Progress Center
1237 Franklin Avenue
Bronx, New York

Hunts Point
Community Progress Center
880 Fox Street
Bronx, New York

South Bronx
Community Progress Center
368 East 149th Street
Bronx, New York

South Jamaica
Community Progress Center
114-02 N.Y. Blvd.
Jamaica, Queens

South Brooklyn
Community Progress Center
78 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York

Fort Greene
Community Progress Center
649 Fulton St.-Rockwell Pl.
Brooklyn, New York

Qualicap Community Progress Center
42-15 Crescent Street
Room 803
Long Island City
Queens, New York

Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth-In-Action
945 Atlantic Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Community Council of Greater New York
225 Park Avenue South
New York, New York

Haryou - Act
181 West 135th Street
New York, New York

Mobilization for Youth
214 East 2nd Street
New York, New York

United Neighborhood Houses
114 East 3rd Street
New York, New York

New York City Mission Society
281 Park Avenue South
New York, New York

United Block Assn.
68 East 131st Street
New York, New York

Brownsville Community Council, Inc.
529 Rockaway Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

APPENDIX C

Staff List

E. Belvin Williams, Ph.D., Project Director
Director, Computer Center
Teachers College
Columbia University

Robert S. Tannenbaum, Co-Director
Associate in the Computer Center
Teachers College
Columbia University

Kenneth W. Wegner, Ph.D., Consultant
Boston College